

SECRET

XAAZ-3606

The problem raised in the case of Herbert ENGELSING is how much of what he says is the truth? ~~We have to do no check on his statements with the exception of his~~ wife. ENGELSING ~~himself~~ has been questioned on three occasions in ~~Germany~~ Europe and twice in this country. It may be said that, although his story has changed somewhat, he has stuck pretty closely to it and such discrepancies as have appeared can be explained through failure to elicit his complete story in the first interviews.

Herbert ENGELSING was born 2 September 1904 in Overath, near Cologne, Germany, and until 1933 was an attorney, then a judge, in Berlin. Upon Hitler's coming to power ENGELSING turned to the film industry and was a successful film director and producer with Tobis. In 1938 he married and he and his wife lived in various parts of Berlin until 1944 when ^{Mrs. E} ~~his wife~~ went to Konstanz, Germany. ENGELSING followed shortly after the close of the war, ~~is not earlier~~. Mrs. ENGELSING joined her parents, ~~Dr.~~ and Mrs. Arthur KOHLER, in California in 1947 and both ENGELSINGS are at the present time in the United States.

According to statements of both Mrs. and Mr. ENGELSING their friendship with the SCHULZE-BOYSEN began in 1938 and ended in 1941. The reasons given for the breaking of that relationship seem on the surface plausible enough - the claim that SCHULZE-BOYSEN turned to the left in late 1941 or early 1942 and discord between SCHULZE-BOYSEN and his wife Libertas. These statements will be taken up in detail. There appears to be no ~~apparent~~ reason to doubt ENGELSING's claim that the relationship was broken off completely at that time as far as his activity as an agent of SCHULZE-BOYSEN is concerned. ENGELSING has freely admitted that he supplied information on political and military actions planned by the German Government before the ~~late~~ end of 1941, that he introduced to SCHULZE-BOYSEN a number of the more useful members of the group, such as ~~WULF~~, ~~SCHULZE~~ ILMER and Hugo ~~WULF~~ ~~WULF~~ ~~WULF~~, and has named eight individuals as his own sources of information. He has also admitted knowing certain members of the group, although they seem to be surprisingly ~~few~~ ~~in number~~ ^{other than those he introduced}

RECORDED
REGISTRY COPY
SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

On the basis of these admissions there can be no doubt of ENGELSING's part in the SCHULZE-BOYSEN group. Indeed his/active participation ~~is~~^{known} makes it appear the more remarkable that he was not picked up with the others. If we consider that the SCHULZE-BOYSEN group was effective from the spring of 1941 to the early fall of 1942 then ENGELSING was an active participant during half of the period of the group's greatest effectiveness as well as during the major portion of the time during which the effectiveness of the group was being built up.

The question therefore arises: What is ENGELSING keeping to himself and why? The answer, which we believe to be much more than an assumption, is that he has constructed a sort of "legenda", part fiction, part fact with the intention of playing up his collaboration with SCHULZE-BOYSEN during a period in which he claims that SCHULZE-BOYSEN was pro-Ally and his withdrawal from contact with SCHULZE-BOYSEN when the latter, according to ENGELSING, turned to the Left. Both claims, the pro-Ally attitude and the late turn to the Left, ie after ENGELSING broke off, we believe to be largely fiction and we will treat these claims below. At this point we may direct attention to the reason motivating ENGELSING to make these claims. We know too little about the man to sketch this more than briefly, but two possibilities at least present themselves: self-preservation or a long-term plan. The former is admittedly more likely and may be considered to be indicated by his marriage in 1938, the establishment of his parents-in-law in the United States in 1939, the claimed withdrawal from the group in 1941 and the concoction of a pro-Ally slant ^{to the activity} on the part of Schulze-BOYSEN during the period of his own collaboration with him.

ENGELSING has made the statement that ~~subsequently~~ SCHULZE-BOYSEN "exhibited a definite pro-Russian philosophy" "either in the fall of 1941 or in the spring of 1942" and he indicates that prior to this time SCHULZE-BOYSEN's orientation was toward the Allies and he was not at all inclined toward Communism. Our information in regard to SCHULZE-BOYSEN's political views and his collaboration with the Soviets has been obtained

from a Gestapo Section IV A 2 report of the 22 December 1942 which indicate^s that SCHULZE-BOYSEN was inclined toward the Soviets throughout his intelligence-gathering activity. The report states flatly: "SCHULZE-BOYSEN's espionage activities began in 1936" and the first record of information passed by the SCHULZE-BOYSENs to the Soviets ~~xxx~~ refers also to 1936 when secret plans ~~substantially~~ for military operations against the Republican Government in Spain were obtained by SCHULZE-BOYSEN and passed to Gisela von POELLNITZ who is reported to have delivered them to the Soviet Embassy in Berlin. ~~Further~~ Indication of his pro-Communist bias prior to 1941 is shown in his recruitment of Horst HEILMANN and Herbert GOLLNOW in 1940 during the time he was lecturing at the Institute of Foreign Affairs of the University of Berlin; of the latter the Gestapo document states: "SCHULZE-BOYSEN was able to convert him (GOLLNOW) to Communism although he had previously been a National Socialist". Likewise, in speaking of the recruitment of Col. Erwin GEHRTS, the Germans, while not mentioning the date of the recruitment, state: "Both (GEHRTS and SCHULZE-BOYSEN) had taken part over a period of years in Communist discussion groups". In summing up the Section IV A 2 report the British comment as follows: "Before 1941 SCHULZE-BOYSEN (and HARNACK) were both ardent Communists". From the above evidence it seems reasonable to conclude that SCHULZE-BOYSEN TURNED to the Left much earlier than the ~~unconventional~~ period noted by ENGELSING.

In respect to passing information to the Allies, ENGELSING has made as much capital as possible out of the supposed passing of information to the British through a certain Count DOUGLAS, Swedish Military Attache in Berlin, whose wife ^{+ is believed} was a sister of SCHULZE-BOYSEN's wife Libertas. No dates for this supposed attempt to give information to the Allies is mentioned and no corroboration has been found except from an extremely interesting individual ~~xxx~~, Hugo BUSCHMANN, whom ENGELSING brought to the ~~American Em-~~ ^{as a contact in Zurich?} ~~bassy in Bern~~ on the 14th of August, 1947 and who in the course of a generally suspect interview supported ENGELSING on several points, among them the supposed innocence of SCHULZE-BOYSEN in regard to Communist theories prior to 1941 and the reported use of

Count DOUGLAS as the "channel to the Western Allies"; no dates were mentioned by BUSCH-MANN as to when this channel was used. ~~Now~~ this DOUGLAS invention would not excite interest especially if it were not for the fact that through the evidence of Manfred ROEDER, the German prosecutor in the SCHULZE-BOYSEN case, and ^{Erich Edgar} E. SCHULZE, the father of SCHULZE-BOYSEN, it can be proved that the DOUGLAS incident was a complete fabrication ~~afforded~~ by SCHULZE-BOYSEN after his arrest and was intended to deceive the Gestapo and ~~prolong~~ postpone as long as possible the execution of the convicted members of his group.

ROEDER's statement on the incident is as follows: "After his arrest SCHULZE-BOYSEN claimed that he had sent certain important documents to Sweden through the Swedish Military Attache in Berlin. If he did not later send a pre-arranged signal, these documents were to be published by February, 1943. Since SCHULZE-BOYSEN was sure (ROEDER believed) ~~that~~ of Germany's collapse early in 1943, he was only trying to delay the execution of his group. The only evidence discovered to support SCHULZE-BOYSEN's story was his social contact with a Swedish Colonel, name unknown, who lived in the house of the actress Marie BARD". E.E. SCHULZE's corroboration of ROEDER's testimony may be found in his published "Harro SCHULZE-BOYSEN" which is in our possession. E.E. SCHULZE was called ^{by the Gestapo} in to visit his son on two occasions, the 30th of September 1942 and the 10th of October 1942 in the hope that his presence might soften his son sufficiently and influence him to reveal the whereabouts of secret documents, supposed by SCHULZE to contain information on Nazi criminals, which the son was believed to have smuggled out of Germany. At the second meeting E.E. SCHULZE was informed by PANZINGER, in charge of conducting the investigation of the case, that his son had agreed to explain about the documents provided the execution of the friends arrested with him be postponed until the 31st of December, 1943. This promise having been made ^{to S.B.} in the presence of his father ^{father} to SCHULZE-BOYSEN the ~~letter~~ ^{father} declared "that he had never sent any secret reports abroad or stolen any papers. All his official papers were in order in his office. He had never

5

prepared to reveal abroad any documents which might be embarrassing to the German Government; the Gestapo's assumption in regard to such documents he had not contradicted because he had conceived the idea of using it as pressure in the interest of his friends." According to SCHULZE, PANWINGER assured him later that the Gestapo would still hold to its part of the bargain.

Also of interest is ENGELSING's insistence that the SCHULZE-BOYSEN did not get along well together which ^{last} ~~fact~~ influenced him and Mrs. ENGELSING to break with their friends. There is no evidence whatsoever that this statement represents the true state of affairs between Harro and Libertas SCHULZE-BOYSEN. ROEDER gave testimony as follows on this point: "Libertas was a firm and loyal Communist and after her own and her husband's arrest she attempted to protect and warn other members of their group." E.E.SCHULZE has published numerous of his son's letters in ~~which~~ ^{slighting reference} none of which is there any ~~reference~~ to Libertas. In his last letter, written shortly before his execution, SCHULZE-BOYSEN wrote: "Libertas is close to me and shares my fate at the same hour". This does not mean that they were the closest of companions but there can be no doubt that they worked together as a team and were ~~both~~ involved equally and together in their treason.

Libertas turned against and betrayed the group and not

Finally, nothing can throw more doubt on the honesty of ENGELSING's testimony than his description of the political views of members of the group known to or intro-

duced by him:	Guenther WEISENBORN	definitely not a Communist
	SCHULHA # stands to the Right	HARNACK - Conservative Socialist
	KUCKHOFF - Right Socialist	HIMPEL - Right Socialist
	TERWIL - Right Socialist	SCHOTTRUELLER - Right Socialist